

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Figs. 12-16 have been amended to be labeled “Prior Art”.

Attachment: 3 Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1-17 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-17 stand rejected.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the Drawings and suggested that Figs. 12-16 should be labeled prior art. The drawings have been labeled as such, accordingly withdrawal of objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 6 due to a minor informality. The informality noted by the Examiner has been corrected. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections

The foregoing amendments to claims 1s and 8 are supported at least by Figs. 1 and 4 and the corresponding descriptions in the specification.

Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections. With respect to independent claim 1, Nakamura '263 discloses that the cross belt members 28A, 28B as shown in Figs 1-3, which are arranged radially outside the spiral belt 26, have a portion of opening space in the center of the width direction (*See*, e.g. claim 1). Nakamura '263 also discloses that when the width C of the opening 32 is less than 1 mm, the opening space 32 is small and the bending rigidity in the vicinity of the center of the crown portion 18 becomes too high, and hence the ride comfort is degraded. *See* para. 53. Accordingly in Nakamura '263, it is essential that the cross belt members have a portion of opening space.

On the other hand, in the present invention, the angled belt (cross belt) does not have such a portion of opening space. If the angled belt had a portion of opening space, it would be

difficult or impossible to attain the optimization of tensile rigidity and bending rigidity of the belt in the close-section direction, thus failing to sufficiently exploit the advantages of the angled belt. *See Spec.* pg. 4, ln. 3-11.

Therefore, the claimed invention is clearly different in the cross belt structure from a tire such as disclosed in Nakamura '263 and thus could not be achieved by the combination of Nakamura '263, Walker, Nakagawa and Kobayashi. Accordingly, since the invention of claim 1 is not taught or fairly suggested by the cited art, Applicant respectfully traverses rejection of claim 1. Dependent claims 2-7 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1.

Independent claim 8 contains similar features as independent claim 1 and should be allowable for analogous reasons. Dependent claims 9-17 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 8.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880 via EFS payment screen. Please

also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven M. Gruskin
Registration No. 36,818

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 3, 2008